



REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

RECEIVED  
JUN -3 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Claim 6 has been amended.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.. The Examiner stated that “the controller” recited on line 1 of claim 6 lacks an antecedent basis. Claim 6 has been amended accordingly.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Applicants’ Admitted Prior Art in view of Baker (USPN 4,913,509). **Regarding claims 1 and 11,** the admitted prior art in view of Baker would not make obvious providing a plurality of test light sources, where each test light source is connected to an optical input switch, as recited in claims 1 and 11.

The Examiner failed to point out anything in Baker that states that a “port” in Baker is an optical input/output switch. The “port” in Baker is not an optical input/output switch. Col. 4, line 61, of Baker describes the “port” as “port 22”. FIG. 1 of Baker shows the port 22 as an electrical input/output device, not an optical switch. Therefore, Col. 3, lines 59-60, of Baker is stating that any known failure detection mechanism of electrical I/O port 22 may be used. Therefore, Baker does not teach any known detection mechanism for an optical switch but an electrical switch. Test light sources and light detectors, as recited in claims 1 and 11, are not known detection mechanisms for failures in electrical switches.

In addition, neither the admitted prior art nor Baker suggests that each test light source is connected to an optical input switch. Neither the admitted prior art nor Baker suggests test light sources. The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a reference for the test light sources. In addition, since Baker is related to optical signal regeneration and not optical switching.

Baker is unrelated to the recited invention, since Baker is related to optical regeneration and electrical switching. Therefore, it would not be obvious to combine Baker with the admitted Art. For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 11 are not made obvious by Admitted Prior Art in view of Baker.



Claims 2-10 and 12-19 each depend either directly or indirectly from the independent claims, and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims. Additionally, these dependent claims require additional elements that, when taken in the context of the claimed invention, further patentably distinguish the art of record. For example, claim 2 further recites detectors optically connected to the output switches. The Admitted Prior Art does not teach connecting detectors to the output switches as argued by the Examiner. Claim 3 further recites a second plurality of detectors where each of the second plurality of detectors is connected to a test light by a fiber optic. Nothing in the Admitted Prior Art or Baker suggests this. Neither the admitted prior art nor Baker teaches such optical detectors. For at least these reasons, claims 2-10 and 12-19 are not anticipated by Baker.

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at telephone number (831) 655-2300.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Michael Lee  
Registration No. 31,846

P.O. Box 778  
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778  
(831) 655-2300

RECEIVED  
JUN -3 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800